REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claim 18 has been amended. New claims 26 and 27 are added.

Applicant has amended the drawings to overcome various informalities. Replacement drawings for FIGs. 1-3 are attached to this response. The margins of FIGs. 1-3 have been corrected.

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been amended as suggested by the Office.

The title of the patent application has been amended as suggested by the Office.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Houha et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,393,585), hereinafter "Houha." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method including providing a plurality of operating systems on a single information handling device, the plurality of operating systems including an appliance operating system to control the information handling device to operate an appliance, and a general operating system to perform general information handling tasks; executing the appliance operating system to control an appliance, wherein the appliance operating system is independent of the general operating system; and executing the general operating system to control the information handling device to perform general information handling tasks.

Houha discloses a computer-implemented method and apparatus for restoring operating systems within a set-top box system. Houha discloses a set-top box system provided with only one operating system, capable of receiving a second, that operates the first operating system in a first memory and switches to the operation of the second operating system upon a predetermined condition, such as detected failures or upgraded operating system availability.

The two operating systems of Houha are general operating system used for the operation of the set-top box. The second operating system replaces the first. Houha does not disclose or suggest an <u>appliance operating system</u> to control an information handling device <u>to operate an appliance</u>, and a <u>general operating system</u> <u>to perform general information handling tasks</u> wherein the appliance operating system is independent of the general operating system as recited in Claim 1. The Office states that the application program of Houha is the same as an appliance operating system. An operating system is not the same as an application program. Even Houha notes the differences between an operating system and an application: "Operating system software is used within the boxes to provide lower-level services to the software applications which operate within the boxes." See Houha, Column 1, lines 15-17.

Because Houha neither discloses nor suggests a method as recited in Claim 1, Claim 1 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Houha. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 1 is respectfully solicited. Claims 2-6 depend from allowable Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason. In addition Claims 2-6 recite additional non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 7 recites a system including a data processor; a bios to provide initial processor control; a memory coupled to said processor; a communications interface; and a plurality of operating systems to be executed by said processor, said plurality of operating systems including: a general operating system capable of performing general information handling tasks; and an appliance operating system capable of controlling, through said communications interface, at least one appliance, wherein said appliance operating system is independent of said general

operating system.

As illustrated above, Houha does not disclose or suggest a system including <u>a general operating system</u> capable of performing general information handling tasks; and <u>an appliance operating system</u> capable of controlling, through said communications interface, at least one appliance, wherein said appliance operating system is independent of said general operating system as recited by Claim 7.

Because Houha neither discloses nor suggests a system as recited in Claim 7, Claim 7 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Houha. For this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 7 is respectfully solicited. Claims 8-17 depend from allowable Claim 7 and are allowable for at least this reason. In addition Claims 8-17 recite additional non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 18 recites a computer readable medium embodying a plurality of instructions, the plurality of instructions including instructions to implement an appliance operating system on a general purpose information handling system; said information handling system to perform general information handling tasks using a general operating system; said appliance operating system to control at least one appliance, wherein said appliance operating system is independent of said general operating system.

As illustrated above, Houha does not disclose or suggest a computer readable medium including instructions to implement <u>an appliance operating system</u> on a <u>general purpose information handling system</u>; said appliance operating system to control at least one appliance, wherein said appliance operating system is independent of said general operating system as recited by Claim 18.

Because Houha neither discloses nor suggests a system as recited in Claim 18, Claim 18 is necessarily not anticipated and non-obvious over Houha. For this reason, withdrawal of the

rejection of Claim 18 is requested, and allowance of independent Claim 18 is respectfully solicited. Claims 19-25 depend from allowable Claim 18 and are allowable for at least this reason. In addition Claims 19-25 recite additional non-obvious subject matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 4 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Houha in view of Bugnion et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,496,847) Claim 4 depends from allowable Claim 1 and is allowable for at least this reason. Claim 22 depends from allowable Claim 18 and is allowable for at least this reason. In addition Claims 4 and 22 recite additional non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant(s) respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicant(s) would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to issue a formal Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Sept. 11, 2003
_____
Date

Rita M. Wisor
_____
Rita M. Wisor, Reg. No. 41,382
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 29567
Austin, Texas 78755-9567
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)